

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MICHAEL ESTRADA,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00494-MMD-BNW

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Michael Estrada brings this action against Defendants Federal Reserve Bank and Jerome Powell under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1.) Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Brenda Weksler, recommending that the Court dismiss the case due to Plaintiff’s failure to update his address. (ECF No. 7.) Plaintiff’s objection to the R&R was due June 14, 2023. To date, Plaintiff has not objected to the R&R. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R in full and dismisses this case without prejudice.

Because there was no objection, the Court need not conduct *de novo* review, and is satisfied that Judge Weksler did not clearly err. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation”). Judge Weksler previously ordered Plaintiff to update his address by May 24, 2023, because the U.S. Postal Service had been unable to deliver a recent filing in his case. (ECF Nos. 4, 5.) In that order, Judge Weksler also warned Plaintiff that his failure to update his address by the deadline might result in dismissal of the case. (ECF No. 5.) See LR IA 3-1 (requiring

1 *pro se* litigants to keep the Court apprised of their address, or face dismissal). The
2 deadline has passed, and despite receiving adequate warning, Plaintiff has not filed his
3 updated address, requested an extension, or otherwise responded to Judge Weksler's
4 order or R&R. Accordingly, the Court adopts Judge Weksler's R&R in full and dismisses
5 the case without prejudice. *See Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of L.A.*, 782 F.2d 829,
6 831 (9th Cir. 1986); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987).

7 It is therefore ordered that Judge Weksler's Report and Recommendation (ECF
8 No. 7) is accepted and adopted in full.

9 It is further ordered that this case is dismissed without prejudice.

10 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.

11 DATED THIS 15th Day of June 2023.

12 
13 _____
14 MIRANDA M. DU
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28